

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action dated August 11, 2004, has been carefully reviewed in light of the Examiner's helpful comments and suggestions.

As an initial matter, Applicant's representatives would like to thank the Examiner for an early indication of allowable subject matter in claims 3, 6, and 10. However, as a result of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fogel. Moreover, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 12, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Colbert. And claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colbert in view of Colvin. These references have been carefully reviewed but are not believed to show or suggest Applicant's invention as now claimed in any manner. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

By the above amendments, claim 1 has been amended to include the substantially the same limitations as claim 4, and claims 4, 13, and 15 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof. Claims 5 through 8 have been amended to correct their dependencies. No new matter has been added. Therefore, Section 103(a) obviousness rejection is rendered moot.

Claim 1 now recites an annular groove formed on an inner circumference of the socket and the resilient ring being disposed in the inner annular groove. None of the cited prior art references shows or teaches this limitation. To the contrary, Fogel teaches a resilient ring 32 disposed on the outer circumference of socket 22.

Similarly, the resilient ring of Colbert is also disposed on the outer circumference of the socket. Colvin does not address the shortcomings of the Fogel and Colbert references. Therefore, in view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over prior art.

Claims 2-3, 5-12, and 14 are dependent from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for the reasons provided in connection with claim 1.

The prior art references made of record by the Examiner have each been considered but are not believed to obviate against the allowability of the claims as amended. It is noted that none of these references has been specifically applied by the Examiner against any of the original claims.

Each issue raised in the Office Action dated August 11, 2004, has been addressed and it is believed that claims 1-3, 5-12, and 14 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore, Applicant respectfully requests a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
DENNISON, SCHULTZ
DOUGHERTY & MACDONALD



By:

Amir H. Behnia
Reg. No. 50,215
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 16